

**From:** bjohnson11@austin.rr.com@inetgw  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/28/02 8:13pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

To Judge Kollar-Kotelly and whom it may concern,

I have been Microsoft Certified Professional since 1993. I've used many Microsoft products in that time. I will continue to do so; either by personal choice or corporate mandate. I'm finding that my non-Microsoft choices are less and less each year.

I work for a Fortune 500 company, using Microsoft's Outlook email client, the number one propagator of modern computer worms, viral or not. I am forced to use the very product that causes myself and my company's resources so much energy to clean up after, time and time again. Although Outlook Express is included on my personal system, I have no such worries about email worms at home as I choose to use a non-Microsoft mail package outside of work.

The proposed settlement does nothing to curb Microsoft's future actions, certainly does nothing to reprimand past actions, and the proof of both is that even in light of Judge Jackson's findings, and the proposed settlement, it hasn't changed any of it's illegal monopolistic leveraging. That alone should be proof that the proposed settlement is entirely un-enforceable, and in-effectual. Without stronger measures Microsoft will continue down the course they've successfully navigated in the past, namely; Embrace, Extend, and Extinguish.

Another concern I have with the PFJ is language which addresses competing "commercial" vendors. The fear of many is that this language fails to protect not-for-profit software projects from anti-competitive behavior. As not-for-profit computing has been equally harmed by Microsoft's anti-competitive practices, the PFS must explicitly grant not-for-profits equal remedy and protection.

Regards,  
Robert Johnson

RJohnson@webside.com